

## REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 7-13 are amended herein.

The Examiner indicated in the Office Action of October 24, 2003 that claims 1-6 are allowable.

The drawings are objected to because where only a single view is used in an application to illustrate the claimed invention, it must not be numbered and the abbreviation "FIG." must not appear. Applicant is submitting a proposed drawing correction showing in red ink the label "FIGURE" for the sole figure.

The drawing is also objected to because, according to the Examiner, suitable descriptive and concise legends should be provided to label the depicted elements of the invention such as the pressure sensor 32, the control unit 28, and the signal means 39 for understanding of the drawing. Applicant is amending the drawing in red ink to include proper descriptive labels as directed by the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to the sole figure are overcome.

The disclosure is objected to because, according to the Examiner, the specification should not make reference to "Fig. 1" in accordance with the above drawing objection. The specification is amended herein to remove the objected to terminology. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification is overcome.

The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because, according to the Examiner, the Abstract of the Disclosure includes legal phraseology. The Abstract is amended herein to remove such legal phraseology. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure is overcome.

Claim 12 is objected to because it should apparently depend from claim 7. Claim 12 is amended herein to correct the claim dependency. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the objection to claim 12 is overcome.

Claims 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Modeer (U.S. Pat. No. 5,800,330). The rejection is traversed and

reconsideration is respectfully requested, particularly in view of the clarifying amendments to the claims.

Modeer is directed to a method and equipment for monitoring a centrifugal separator, with a separation chamber. A radially inner outlet is connected to the separation chamber, which is connected to an outlet conduit. A flow sensor in the outlet conduit is arranged to indicate a flow in the outlet conduit. An intermittently operable radially outer outlet is connected to the separation chamber. The flow of the separated component in the outlet conduit ceases temporarily until the separation chamber has been refilled. In order to monitor the centrifugal separator in a reliable and easy manner the time for refilling the separation chamber is measured and is compared with a shortest allowable time for refilling the separation chamber stored in a memory unit, and a signal is given if the measured time is shorter than the shortest allowable time stored in the memory unit.

Unlike the invention recited in claim 7 of the present application, Modeer does not teach or suggest a device for indicating an undesired operating condition of a centrifugal separator including means for activating a signal means to generate an error signal in response to a pressure sensor detecting during a predetermined period of time of the operation of the centrifugal separator, a course of pressure change in the outlet conduit differing from an expected normal course of pressure change, when inlet and outlet valves during the predetermined period of time are adjusted in valve positions which at least substantially decreases the flows in the supply and outlet conduits from the normal flows therein. Instead, Modeer detects pressure changes, but is silent on activating an error signal when a pressure change differs from an expected normal course of pressure change.

For an anticipation rejection to be appropriate, each and every limitation in a rejected claim must be disclosed in a single prior art reference used in the claim rejection. Because Modeer does not teach or suggest a device for indicating an undesired operating condition of a centrifugal separator including an activating means as recited in amended independent claim 7 of the present application, it

cannot be maintained that Modeer anticipates claim 7. Moreover, because claims 8-13 each depend from and thereby incorporate the limitations of claim 7, these dependent claims are likewise deemed not anticipated by Modeer for at least the reasons set forth for claim 7.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6 are allowed, and that amended claims 7-13 are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicant herein petitions for a one month extension of time to file this Response. A check in the amount of \$110.00 is included to cover the extension fee. No additional fees or deficiencies in fees are believed to be owed. However, authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 13-0235 in the event any such fees are owed.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Richard R. Michaud  
Registration No. 40,088  
Attorney For Applicant

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP  
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-3402  
(860) 549-5290